NEUCONOMICA

Ethical and Policy Paradox Sustaned by Educational Institutes

Ayush Datta

Author

Ayush Dutta
Doctoral Fellow, Faculty. Dept. of Management
Techno India Universi**ty**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This book is the culmination of countless hours of reflection, research, and relentless questioning — a journey I could not have walked alone.

First and foremost, I bow in gratitude to my parents, Mr. Ashis Dutta and Dr. Anindita Dutta, whose love, guidance, and sacrifices shaped every part of my being. Their faith has been my anchor through every challenge and every pursuit of meaning.

I extend heartfelt thanks to my mentors and teachers who have inspired me to question, to analyze, and to think beyond conventions. Their wisdom has illuminated the path toward this interdisciplinary exploration.

To my friends and peers who have supported me with patience and encouragement — thank you for reminding me of the importance of dialogue and shared purpose.

Above all, this book is a tribute to those who believe that intellect and empathy can coexist — that knowledge must serve humanity.

The Exploitation of Sustainable Competitive

Advantage by Indian Institutes of Management: An Ethical and Policy Paradox

Abstract

The treatise challenges the Sustainable Competitive Advantage (SCA) construct its implementation or, more precisely, co-implementation of the SCA concept in the Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs). The path being followed by the IIMs portrays that the notion of SCA is re-defined as an economic seclusion and logo domination tool, contrary to customary knowledge of the concept as an engine of organizational uniqueness and imagination. Using the normative, economic and ethical prisms, this current discussion has shown that the IIMs have used institutional autonomy and brand equity to foster exclusivity at the cost of accessibility on a greater scale. The essay describes the conflicts between the professorial ethos promoted by the IIMs and the administrative facts it generates, and it also gives policy suggestions that could help recover educational equity and social accountability.

Introduction

The seminal contributions in management education and leadership development are generally recognized all over the world as achieved by the Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs). They were based on the post-independence vision of capacity building, and they were to be castles of excellence that would support the developmental agenda of the country. However, in the face of the exorbitant tuition costs that are higher than 20–990 lakh of two-year postgraduate programme fees, there have been reviews claiming that the IIMs have become commercialized promoting education and the subsequent cost reduction of accessibility (Indian Express, 2018).

The paradox of this work is the doubled position of the IIMs that on the one hand affirm the precept of Sustainable Competitive Advantage (SCA), and at the same time implement it as an institutional policy to protect the exclusivity and dominate the market. The investigation is conducted under the ethical and legal implications of such a phenomenon in the context of the IIM Act (2017), the UGC policies, and the constitutional right of equal education, in general.

Sustainable Competitive Advantage (SCA) as a Theoretical Framework

In his paradigm, *Competitive Advantage* (1985), Michael Porter described competitive advantage as the ability of a firm to outperform its competitors through incorporating either a better cost leadership approach, differentiation approach, or a niche approach. In 1991, this debate was furthered by Barney in the work he called the *Resource-Based View (RBV)* and he used a model of Sustainable advantage and he said that it establishes when the resources held by an organization possessed the characteristics of Value, Rarity, Inimitability and Non-substitutability — a framework popularly known as *VRIN*.

Whenever there is a projection of these theoretical constructs into the real context of higher learning, the resources that are considered in this regard include faculty experience, pedagogic scholarly reforms, institutional brand loyalty, alumni web, as well as, level of scholarly freedom. However, these assets when encapsulated to be used as the instruments of exclusion as opposed to empowerment can turn these processes into mechanisms of systemic exploitation instead of behemoths to innovation.

An Institutional Background: IIMs and Autonomy in the IIM Act, 2017

The IIM Act of 2017 granted extensive freedom to the Indian Institutes of Management, thus authorized to design their curricula, their own internal methods, and the charges levied (Ministry of Education, 2017). Though the notion of autonomy was encouraged as a factor that provided academic freedom, it simultaneously eliminated the governmental privilege to observe fee arrangements.

In 2018, the Ministry presented the draft regulations of certifying that IIMs are under the channel of keeping their tuition fees under the commensurable expenditure plans and expansion plans (Indian Express, 2018). A significant group of IIMs was opposed to such requirements arguing that it had violated their sovereign rights to academics. It is an example of how a seemingly valid academic right may be turned into a tactical resource to maintain financial and operational secrecy.

Exploitation of SCA by IIMs

4.1 Fee Escalation as Market Indicator

Instead of reflecting the actual cost of operations, the steady increase in trademarks at IIM has been more likely an instrument of branding defined in monetary terms, the marker of exclusivity and high status. Similar to the luxury goods market, the increased cost makes more value ingrained. This act conforms to the notion of differentiation strategy as by Porter (1985) but conversely does not conform to the constitutional provision that education is supposed to be considered a public good (*Mohini Jain v. State of Karnataka*, 1992).

4.2 Alumni Network: Social Capital Network Viewed as a Controlled Entity

Using their large alumni networks as competitive edge, as observers of scholarly fraternities have found, Indian Institutes of Management have made themselves the pathway to Indian corporate elite. Yet, acquiring access to such a network is considerably dependent on exposing oneself to considerably large financial expenses, which, in turn, turn an otherwise communal good into social capital that is commodified. The brand is built on the network and the network in turn maintains high tuition charges — establishing a closed self-perpetuating ecosystem.

4.3 Reputation Shielding and Lack of Accountability

The historical reputation of IIMs protects them to a certain extent from questioning on matters regarding the justification of the fee, ratio between the faculty and the students and excesses. They have an unmatched reputation such as a cushion of protection, which is exactly what a sustainable advantage entails under the VRIN framework. But in this context, the prestige advances institutional impunity to the prejudice of academic excellence.

4.4 The Meritocracy Fallacy

Though the (theoretically) merit-based admissions are based on the Common Admission Test, the admission does not offer even financial accessibility post admission. Students with underprivileged or low-income backgrounds struggle to continue education, though they have made merit-based achievements. Thus, meritocracy turns to narrative but not practice, contributing to the strengthening of stratification among classes, instead of leading to social mobility.

Ethical and Policy Implications

The official IIM way of functioning encourages the marketization of education, but it is social responsibility rather than the sustainability of institutions. This conflicts with the principle of morality provided in the Directive Principles of State Policy (Articles 38 and 39), as well as with the law (judicial precedents) like *Unni Krishnan, J.P. v. State of Andhra Pradesh* (1993) that states that education cannot be quantified and appear as a commodity.

Dimension Serving as a Guideline to Vivo

Theoretical Basis	IIM Practice
Autonomy	Promotes innovation – Applied in an attempt to avoid responsibility
Differentiation	Accidental to academic quality – Differentiation + Economic exclusivity
Creation of Values	Society good value miswithin students
Equity	Ever-present access inclusivity – Socio-Economic exclusion

---

The Institutions and the Institutional Exploitation Consequences

- **Economic Stratification:** Unreasonable charges deprive poor students in the lower strata of education.
- **Intellectual Monopoly:** Research and management thinking being trapped in select elite campuses.
- **Cultural Homogeneity:** Diversity is lack of experimentation and empathy towards social issues.
- **Ethical Contradiction:** Social responsibility and stakeholder ethics are taught in institutions, which go against them.

Policy Recommendations

The following are some of the measures proposed in making IIMs back to track in regard to national ethical standards and equity in education:

1. **Fee Rationalization Commission:** Have a statutory agency audit and certify the fee structure on regular intervals.
2. **Clear Financial Reporting:** Independent publication of audited financial reports of fee use, faculty remuneration ratios, and expenses of structures once a year.

3. **Equity Scholarships:** ¼ revenues must be returned to need aid.
4. **Ethics Accreditation:** Attach rankings and funding to quantifiable indicators of affordability, diversity and inclusion.

5. **Social Accountability Charter:** Every IIM is bound to issue an annual report on Social Responsibility in accordance with the provisions of the IIM Act.

Conclusion

Sustainable Competitive Advantage as practised by the IIMs crossed the stage of being a pedagogical principle to being an institutional power tool. Perpetuating the dominance through autonomy, brand capital and exclusivity, they represent the exact direction of corporate behaviour that they do not admire in classrooms. Such paradox distorts the moral and constitutional objective or purpose of education as a social service.

The balance between autonomy and accountability should be redone; not to take away the excellence of the IIMs, but so that they can have true sustainability with regards to debts affecting their competitive advantage, both technically morally and socially and important in human context as well.

References (APA 7th Edition)

Barney, J. (1991). *Stable competitive advantage and firm resources.* Journal of Management, 17(1), 99-120.

Indian Express. (2018, June 22). *IIMs rebuff new act draft rules about fee clauses*. https://indianexpress.com/article/india/iims-object-to-fee-clause-in-draft-rules-undernew-act-5226381/

Ministry of Education. (2017). *The Indian Institutes of Management Act, 2017.* Government of India.

Mohini Jain v. State of Karnataka, AIR 1992 SC 1858.

Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive Advantage: Designing and Maintaining Excellence Performance.* Free Press.

Unni Krishnan, J.P. v. State of Andhra Pradesh, (1993) 1 SCC 645.

University Grants Commission. (2022). *Fee Structure Policy Disclosure and Refund Policy Guidelines.* UGC, New Delhi.

The Neuroeconomics of Employee Motivation: How to Reinterpret Maslow in the AI Age

By
Ayush Dutta,
Doctoral Fellow,
Dept. of Management

Abstract

The meeting point of artificial intelligence (AI) and neuroscience is also making the background of human motivation reassessed in the modern context of organisational management. People used to know the phenomenon of engagement and performance of employees long based on traditional theories, among which is hierarchy of needs by Abraham Maslow. However, these traditional paradigms should be questioned

especially in the era of algorithmic decision-making where neurobiological knowledge prevails. This paper suggests a neuroeconomic image of employee motivation with the merging of cognitive neuroscience, behavioural economics, and organisational psychology. Through the analysis of neural networks and algorithmic forms of feedback that determine the decision-making process, the production of rewards, and emotional regulatory processes of such AIenhanced workplaces, we shed some light on the delicate interplay between biological motivations and technological responses. We propose an evolving, flexible theory of motivation relevant to Industry 5.0 as a synthesis of the hierarchical models provided by Maslow with the definition of dopaminergic reward systems, predictive coding, and algorithmic reinforcements. Besides, we probe the ethical and administrative implications of embracing AI in human-resource systems, especially in autonomy, equity, and the psychological well-being. We conclude with our suggestion to adopt a new paradigm in which human neurobiology will be in synergy with technological intelligence and can result in sustainable and humane productivity in the era of machine learning.

Keywords: neo-economics, employee motivation, Maslows hierarchy of needs, artificial intelligence, organisational behaviour, reward system, adaptive motivation

Chapter 1: Introduction

The issue of motivation has traditionally taken centre stage in the management theory and it has been one of the most debated and persistent issues. Hierarchy of needs, which Abraham Maslow presented in 1943, have historically been used as the theoretical framework used to explain organisational behaviour in the form of a consistent, hierarchical pyramid of human wants and needs. The twenty-first-century work environment, with AI, neurotech and algorithmic employee

management, however, flouts the structural premises on which this model is based.

The modern worker is more than just a basic economic mechanism seeking to obtain safety an fit; it is an advanced cognitive system that integrated into neuro-digital systems. They even interact with performance evaluating algorithms suggesting tasks and predicting burnout using even biometric or behavioural data (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2017). These interactions, in turn, affect neural reactions towards expectations of rewards, anxiety as well as thinking load. Neuroeconomics, a newly focused research field, provides the methodological opportunities that are needed to explain such extremely dynamic processes. Conjecturing neuroscience, psychology, and economics, neuroeconomics examines the improbability by which reward structures and decision-making systems of the cerebral lobe affect behaviour in a condition of uncertainty (Glimcher and Fehr, 2014). When applied to the discipline of management, this viewpoint provides information on the nature of motivation, engagement, and organisational loyalty change in AI-mediated settings. This paper however redefines the hierarchy of Maslow on a neuroeconomic basis that the classical model needs to advance into a more neuroadaptative system where intrinsic neurally motivated drives and extrinsic technological rewards work hand in hand with technological expensive stimuli. This new model acknowledges the two forces of biological and algorithmic reward characteristic of modern employee motivation.

In the modern context of organisational management, the artificial intelligence (AI) and neuroscience contribute to the joint re-defining of human motivation. Historically, the frameworks of classical theories have been used to explain employee engagement and their performance, such as the hierarchy of needs by Abraham Maslow. However, when an economy is being dominated by algorithmic decision-making and neurobiological knowledge, these conventional motivational paradigms should be approached critically. The manuscript presents a neuroeconomic viewpoint on employee motivation- a combination of

cognitive neuroscience, behavioural economics and organisational psychology. It examines the neural network and algorithmic feedback processes of decision-making, reward processing and emotional regulation in AI-based workplaces. The paper suggests a dynamic model of adaptive motivation that would be relevant to Industry 5.0 by combining the hierarchical constructs of Maslow with neuroeconomic evidence of dopaminergic reward circuitry, predictive coding and algorithmic reinforcement. It also asks the question of what ethical and managerial consequences there are of implementing AI in humanresource systems that affect autonomy, equity, and psychological wellbeing. It ends with a conclusion that promotes the new paradigm in motivation that balances human neurobiology and technological intelligence, therefore, to establish sustainable and humane productivity in the age of machine learning.

Chapter 2: Returning to Maslow in the Contemporary Work Environment

A Theory of Human Motivation (1943) by Maslow came up with a fivetier hierarchy which included physiological, safety, love/belonging, esteem, and self-actualisation. Later amendments included selftranscendence (Maslow, 1969). The model assumes that there is a linear increase: after satisfying lower needs, higher aspirations take over. In modern studies, this linearity is challenged. Cross-cultural research (Tay and Diener, 2011) reveals a fact that people have several needs simultaneously, and digital environment reconstructs the way of realization of these needs. To give an example, belonging can now be achieved through online teamwork, and esteem can now be enhanced by algorithms as a performance dashboard or social recognition platform (Davenport et al., 2020).

Work places powered by AI make the hierarchy even more difficult. Psychological needs can be both met and endangered at the same time using digital surveillance, algorithmic appraisal systems, and predictive

analytics. An actual-time productivity display may increase security because of the provision of stability but will destroy respect since it will affect perceived autonomy.

The framework introduced by Maslow, so beautiful in simplicity, was never created to be used in neuro-augmented ecologies. Its redefinition requires the interaction with the modern discoveries of neuroscience and behavioural economics in order to capture the interaction between the motivational architecture of the brain with work structures mediated by AI.

Chapter 3: The Emergence of Neuroeconomics in Management Behaviour

3.1 Defining Neuroeconomics

Neuroeconomics explores the brain and how it assesses rewards, makes decisions and deals with risk (Camerer, Loewenstein, and Prelec, 2005). It explains by incorporating neurobiology, cognitive psychology and economics the neural processes within preferences and behaviours. In organisational terms, neuroeconomics unravels motivation on a neural level, especially the way that dopamine, serotonin and oxytocin influence engagement, cooperation and trust. Neuroimaging evidence suggests that intrinsic rewards cause activation of ventral striatum and prefrontal cortex, which are areas that deal with anticipation and satisfaction with the decision made (Knutson and Greer, 2008).

3.2 Behavioural Economics to Neural Insights

Behavioural economics was a critique of rational choice theory but was much descriptive. Neuroeconomics takes it a step further to map the biases on to the neural circuitry. Indicatively, the loss aversion, which is one of the foundations of the prospect theory (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979), is associated with an increased amygdala activation when anticipating a loss.

Applying them to management, it can be implied that motivation systems solely based on extrinsic rewards (bonuses, promotions) can ignore neurobiological aspects of intrinsic satisfaction, creativity, and social inclusion.

3.3 Neurobiological Principles of Motivation

3.3.1 Dopaminergic and Reward Anticipation

Dopamine is a neurotransmitter, which is at the core of neuroeconomic theory, dealing with the prediction of rewards and reinforcement learning (Schultz, 2015). Expecting reward is likely to arouse more dopaminergic discharge than reward itself and this implies that expectation generates more drive than result.
Dopaminergic prediction error is decisive in the context of workplaces where AI is constantly detected by monitoring performance. Feedback, whether positive or negative, which is not dictated by an algorithm causes employees to change behaviourally. Therefore, motivation can be neurologically controlled through digital feedback loops that increase engagement or cause stress.

3.3.2 Neural Plasticity and Motivation to Learn

Neuroscience lays stress on plasticity the ability of the brain to restructure with the experience (Draganski et al., 2004). The adaptability is leveraged through continuous learning systems that are AI-driven and provide real-time development of skills. As they are ethically formulated, they are parallel to the Maslow self-actualisation need and the employees can thus grow dynamically instead of in steps.

Chapter 4: AI-Powered Motivation Systems: Behavioural Nudges and Intelligent Incentives

Artificial intelligence has quickly become one of the powerhouses of an employee experience in the present-day world. Different digital dashboards, wearable sensors, and state-of-the-art predictive analytics

can now help to harvest information about productivity, attention, and affective states. These technological systems form the basis of what we call behavioural nudging – drastically subtle suggestions that are enacted procedurally to direct decision-making toward preset organizational reaction (Thaler and Sunstein, 2008).

Such nudges disarm a reward circuitry of the brain in terms of neuroeconomics. An example is as follows: gamified performance platforms trigger short-term bursts of dopaminergic release, which occurs due to such mechanisms as points, badges, social recognition. Whenever overused though, they may cause reward fatigue and thus desensitize the neural circuits appropriate to support incentive responsiveness (Montague and Berns, 2002).

More sophisticated systems are highly relying on affective computing to measure emotional conditions and various kinds of feedback to be provided according to the context (Picard, 2010). In case the tones of the voice of a worker or her rhythm in typing a text may indicate an increased stress level, the algorithm inside the system may prescribe a stay break- which will have a democratic effect of providing some kind of digital neuro-regulation. Although this kind of intervention can positively contribute to overall wellbeing, urgent ethical concerns seem to surround consent, autonomy, and surveillance (Zuboff, 2019).

Therefore, the work poses a paradox to the managers: AI systems energizing by operating on a neurochemical level can also destroy the psychological agency, forcing managers to create a balanced approach to operational efficiency and ethical conservatism.

Chapter 5: Neuroethical Issues in the Algorithmic Age of Management

5.1 Autonomy and the Illusion of Choice

The perceptions of autonomy can significantly decrease when belongings among employees are predicted and managed by the

utilization of algorithms to manage their behaviour. Neuroeconomics acknowledges autonomy as a condition that supports sustaining intrinsic motivation and this is mediated by the activity in the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (Murayama et al., 2010). Intrusive regulation of algorithms inhibits activity in these key areas, instead of allowing a real practice.

5.2 Privacy and Cognitive Sovereignty

Privacy controls in the psychological area of cognitive sovereignty against utilitarianism, but freedom-of-thought issues are not addressed. The possibility to directly explain attention and emotion by EEG or fNIRS apparatus becomes a reality as neurotechnologies improve. Researchers caution of an impending danger on cognitive privacy of a mental autonomy (Ienca & Andorno, 2017). In an organizational setting, this danger may be in the form of neural Taylorism, where intellectual information is scaled down to performance browsing data.

5.3 Algorithmic Bias and Fairness

The term algorithmic bias and fairness is closely related to the prism of sanitized AI, just like synthetic metrics and synthetic object are. The existence of bias in the training data is always transferred to AI systems. The image of unfair treatment makes the anterior insula, the part of the brain that links moral outrage and nudging, to be active neuroeconomically (Sanfey et al., 2003). The ongoing discrimination destroys trust and self-motivation and, therefore, what is needed is clear governance models that avoid the alignment of AI-mediated incentives with neural fairness mechanism.

Chapter 6: Towards a Motivation Adaptive Neuroeconomic Model

6.1 Core Components

1. **Intrinsic Neural Drivers** – The biological components of motivation are dopaminergic anticipation, social bonding mediated by oxytocin and prefrontal goal regulation.
2. **Feedback Systems: Algorithmic Feedback Systems** – Artificial intelligence platforms would provide real-time stimulus content that would either support or interfere with intrinsic motivation.
3. **Cognitive-Emotional Modulators** – The triggers affecting the neural activation by algorithmic cues are mediated by stress, fatigue, and social contexts.
4. **Boundary Conditions: Ethical** – To protect the principle of autonomy, transparency, and fairness, the motivation systems must not exceed the psychological and neuroethical limits of motivation.

6.2 Interaction

The states of motivation in the Adaptive Motivation Model (AMM) are characterized to be in oscillation instead of a hierarchical ladder.
Twoway communication between the neural workings and the computer algorithms is meant to provide the unceasing re-calibration of effort, engagement, and satisfaction. Therefore, the motivational process can be said to be homeostatic – it is aimed at establishing a stable level or equilibrium between the challenge and the reward (Carver and Scheier, 1998).
Application of the validities of AMM would involve developing artificial intelligence systems that:

- Individualise rewards and maintain the individual agency by doing so;
- Have an uncanny balance of uncertainty in order to keep dopaminergic interest;
- Give open-minded ethical guarantees to maintain trust.

Chapter 7: Neuroeconomic Motivation and Organisational Implications

7.1 Remaking Performance Metrics

The traditional measures include mostly output. Neuroeconomic measures, in its turn, underline quality of the engagement. Managers will receive neuroscientific understanding of neural effort as an AI-based measure of attentional variability, social sentiment, or cognitive-loading, instead of just productivity (Grant, 2019).

7.2 Hybrid Intelligence System Leadership

Leaders have to operate as interpreters of human and machine thinking. The theory of neuroleadership (Rock, 2009) argues that a sensitive view on the manner in which the brain reacts to danger and compensations increases empathetic leadership. This in AI settings is translated into the process of calibration, of algorithm requirements, to humanity neural capability.

Evidence indicates that a learner establishing learning objectives tends to accomplish them more effectively when self-actualisation occurs in preparation for success (Ryan, 2008). Writings suggest that when a learner sets learning goals, they are usually more successful in achieving the goals when there is self-actualisation in anticipation of success (Ryan, 2008).

Adaptive learning platforms using AI allow employees to have individualized mastery. It has been neuroimaged that self-directed learning triggers the brain through the hippocampus and the dopaminergic midbrain and this further supports curiosity (Gruber et al., 2014). Therefore, AI can be used as a facilitator of the Maslowian selfactualisation provided that it is used to enlarge, but not narrow down human potential.

7.3 Cross-Disciplinary Integration

- Economics provides the formal model of utility, cost-benefit and rational choice.
- Neuroscience is the source of empirical evidence of the biological limitations of rationality.
- Artificial Intelligence deploys these understandings in operating systems in real time.
  This can be integrated to help design organisations in advance; these companies are able to model in outputs of incentive structures on neural activity and by bypass the end product of this activity, productivity. However, excessive reliance on the predictive model indicates a danger of lowering the motivation to the mechanistic conditioning. As a response, organisations need to integrate reflective human supervision, which is a metacognitive strata that ensures that decisions are value-based.

Chapter 4: AI-Powered Motivation Systems: Behavioural Nudges and Intelligent Incentives

Artificial intelligence has quickly become one of the powerhouses of an employee experience in the present-day world. Different digital dashboards, wearable sensors, and state-of-the-art predictive analytics can now help to harvest information about productivity, attention, and affective states. These technological systems form the basis of what we call behavioural nudging – drastically subtle suggestions that are enacted procedurally to direct decision-making toward preset organizational reaction (Thaler and Sunstein, 2008).

Such nudges disarm a reward circuitry of the brain in terms of neuroeconomics. An example is as follows: gamified performance platforms trigger short-term bursts of dopaminergic release, which occurs due to such mechanisms as points, badges, social recognition.

Whenever overused though, they may cause reward fatigue and thus desensitize the neural circuits appropriate to support incentive responsiveness (Montague and Berns, 2002).
More sophisticated systems are highly relying on affective computing to measure emotional conditions and various kinds of feedback to be provided according to the context (Picard, 2010). In case the tones of the voice of a worker or her rhythm in typing a text may indicate an increased stress level, the algorithm inside the system may prescribe a stay break- which will have a democratic effect of providing some kind of digital neuro-regulation. Although this kind of intervention can positively contribute to overall wellbeing, urgent ethical concerns seem to surround consent, autonomy, and surveillance (Zuboff, 2019).
Therefore, the work poses a paradox to the managers: AI systems energizing by operating on a neurochemical level can also destroy the psychological agency, forcing managers to create a balanced approach to operational efficiency and ethical conservatism.

Chapter 5: Neuroethical Issues in the Algorithmic Age of Management

5.1 Autonomy and the Illusion of Choice

The perceptions of autonomy can significantly decrease when belongings among employees are predicted and managed by the utilization of algorithms to manage their behaviour. Neuroeconomics acknowledges autonomy as a condition that supports sustaining intrinsic motivation and this is mediated by the activity in the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (Murayama et al., 2010). Intrusive regulation of algorithms inhibits activity in these key areas, instead of allowing a real practice.

5.2 Privacy and Cognitive Sovereignty

Privacy controls in the psychological area of cognitive sovereignty against utilitarianism, but freedom-of-thought issues are not addressed.

The possibility to directly explain attention and emotion by EEG or fNIRS apparatus becomes a reality as neurotechnologies improve. Researchers caution of an impending danger on cognitive privacy of a mental autonomy (Ienca & Andorno, 2017). In an organizational setting, this danger may be in the form of neural Taylorism, where intellectual information is scaled down to performance browsing data.

5.3 Algorithmic Bias and Fairness

The term algorithmic bias and fairness is closely related to the prism of sanitized AI, just like synthetic metrics and synthetic object are. The existence of bias in the training data is always transferred to AI systems. The image of unfair treatment makes the anterior insula, the part of the brain that links moral outrage and nudging, to be active neuroeconomically (Sanfey et al., 2003). The ongoing discrimination destroys trust and self-motivation and, therefore, what is needed is clear governance models that avoid the alignment of AI-mediated incentives with neural fairness mechanism.

Chapter 6: Towards a Motivation Adaptive Neuroeconomic Model

6.1 Core Components

1. **Intrinsic Neural Drivers** – The biological components of motivation are dopaminergic anticipation, social bonding mediated by oxytocin and prefrontal goal regulation.
2. **Feedback Systems: Algorithmic Feedback Systems** – Artificial intelligence platforms would provide real-time stimulus content that would either support or interfere with intrinsic motivation.
3. **Cognitive-Emotional Modulators** – The triggers affecting the neural activation by algorithmic cues are mediated by stress, fatigue, and social contexts.
4. **Boundary Conditions: Ethical** – To protect the principle of autonomy, transparency, and fairness, the motivation systems must not exceed the psychological and neuroethical limits of motivation.

6.2 Interaction

The states of motivation in the Adaptive Motivation Model (AMM) are characterized to be in oscillation instead of a hierarchical ladder. Twoway communication between the neural workings and the computer algorithms is meant to provide the unceasing re-calibration of effort, engagement, and satisfaction. Therefore, the motivational process can be said to be homeostatic – it is aimed at establishing a stable level or equilibrium between the challenge and the reward (Carver and Scheier, 1998).

Application of the validities of AMM would involve developing artificial intelligence systems that:

- Individualise rewards and maintain the individual agency by doing so;
- Have an uncanny balance of uncertainty in order to keep dopaminergic interest;
- Give open-minded ethical guarantees to maintain trust.

Chapter 7: Neuroeconomic Motivation and Organisational Implications

7.1 Remaking Performance Metrics

The traditional measures include mostly output. Neuroeconomic measures, in its turn, underline quality of the engagement. Managers will receive neuroscientific understanding of neural effort as an AI-based measure of attentional variability, social sentiment, or cognitive-loading, instead of just productivity (Grant, 2019).

7.2 Hybrid Intelligence System Leadership

Leaders have to operate as interpreters of human and machine thinking. The theory of neuroleadership (Rock, 2009) argues that a sensitive view on the manner in which the brain reacts to danger and compensations increases empathetic leadership. This in AI settings is translated into the

process of calibration, of algorithm requirements, to humanity neural capability.

Evidence indicates that a learner establishing learning objectives tends to accomplish them more effectively when self-actualisation occurs in preparation for success (Ryan, 2008). Writings suggest that when a learner sets learning goals, they are usually more successful in achieving the goals when there is self-actualisation in anticipation of success (Ryan, 2008).

Adaptive learning platforms using AI allow employees to have individualized mastery. It has been neuroimaged that self-directed learning triggers the brain through the hippocampus and the dopaminergic midbrain and this further supports curiosity (Gruber et al., 2014). Therefore, AI can be used as a facilitator of the Maslowian selfactualisation provided that it is used to enlarge, but not narrow down human potential.

7.3 Cross-Disciplinary Integration

- Economics provides the formal model of utility, cost-benefit and rational choice.
- Neuroscience is the source of empirical evidence of the biological limitations of rationality.
- Artificial Intelligence deploys these understandings in operating systems in real time.

This can be integrated to help design organisations in advance; these companies are able to model in outputs of incentive structures on neural activity and by bypass the end product of this activity, productivity. However, excessive reliance on the predictive model indicates a danger of lowering the motivation to the mechanistic conditioning. As a response, organisations need to integrate reflective human supervision, which is a metacognitive strata that ensures that decisions are value-based.

Chapter 8: Re-Interpretation of Self-Actualisation in the AI Era

Self-actualisation, which is the highest level that emerged by Maslow, can typically refer to self-improvement and self-fulfilment. During the AI era it turns into co-actualisation – the symbiotic evolution of human and machine intelligence. To the neurons, self-actualisation involves a long-term task of the default mode network (DMN) and creative performance and introspection (Beaty et al., 2016).

This can be promoted by AI through automation of repetitive processes, and it will release cognitive bandwidth for reflection and innovation. Nevertheless, it is possible that automation will crash the purpose, which is an essential driver. Managers need to create conditions whereby technology increases and not obliterates human meaning.

Chapter 9: Conclusion

This paper redefines the hierarchy of Maslow in the light of the recently developing science of neuroeconomics, which holds that motivation in an era of AI is nonlinear and psycholess but cyber-neuronal, the result of the interplay of the brain reward system and smart programs.

The offered Adaptive Motivation Model combines the neurobiological, economics, and ethical levels and provides a mode of maintaining the engagement without denying autonomy. It encourages managers to move from simply managing behaviour to taking care of neural experiences that realise organisational goals and human dignity.

Overall, the neuroeconomic redefinition of motivation welcomes an alternative managerial thinking: not to treat workers as data points or neural automatons, but as biocognitive members of the common network

of intelligence. The ultimate potential of motivation in the twenty-first century can only be harnessed using the harmonisation of human neurobiology with artificial cognition organisations.

References

Beaty, R.E., Benedek, M., Silvia, P.J., and Schacter, D.L., (2016). Functional connectivity, creative cognition, and default mode network: A functional homology study. *Neuropsychologia, 99*, 92–98.

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). *Machine, platform, crowd: Taking advantage of our digital future.* W. W. Norton.

Camerer, C. F., Loewenstein, G., and Prelec, D., (2005). Introduction: The field of neuroeconomics aims to provide economics with new insights into the brain's characteristics. *Journal of Economic Literature, 43*(1), 9-64.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). *On the self-management of acting.* Cambridge University Press.

Davenport, T.H., Guha, A., Grewal, D., and Bressgott, T. (2020). The ways that artificial intelligence will transform marketing in the future. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 48*(1), 24-42.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). *Self-determination theory: From motivation or development towards wellness rather than just the basic psychological needs.* Guilford Press.

Draganski, B., Gaser, C., Busch, V., Schuierer, G., Bogdahn, U., & May, A. (2004). Neuroplasticity: Changes in grey matter induced by training. *Nature, 427*, 311-312.

Glimcher, P. W., & Fehr, E. (2014). *Neuroeconomics: Decision making and the brain.* Academic Press.

Grant, A. M. (2019). The neuroscience of motivation in the workplace. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 6*, 1–24.

Gruber, M. J., Gelman, B. D., & Ranganath, C. (2014). States of curiosity modulate hippocampus-dependent learning via the dopaminergic circuit. *Neuron, 84*(2), 486–496.
Ienca, M., & Andorno, R. (2017). Towards new human rights in the age of neuroscience and neurotechnology. *Life Sciences, Society and Policy, 13*, 5.
Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica, 47*(2), 263-291.
Knutson, B., & Greer, S. M. (2008). Anticipatory affect: Neural correlates and consequences for choice. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, 363*, 3771-3786.
Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*, 370–396.
Maslow, A. H. (1969). *Toward a psychology of being* (2nd ed.). Van Nostrand.
Montague, P. R., & Berns, G. S. (2002). Neural economics and the biological substrates of valuation. *Neuron, 36*(2), 265-284.
Murayama, K., Matsumoto, M., Izuma, K., & Matsumoto, K. (2010). Neural basis of the undermining effect of monetary reward on intrinsic motivation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 107*(49), 20911–20916.
Picard, R. W. (2010). *Affective computing: From laughter to IEEE Transactions.* MIT Press.
Rock, D. (2009). *Your brain at work: Strategies for overcoming distraction, regaining focus, and working smarter all day long.* HarperCollins.
Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory and well-being. *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles, 2*, 23-44.
Sanfey, A. G., Rilling, J. K., Aronson, J. A., Nystrom, L. E., & Cohen, J. D. (2003). The neural basis of economic decision-making in the ultimatum game. *Science, 300*(5626), 1755-1758.
Schultz, W. (2015). Neuronal reward and decision signals: From theories to data. *Physiological Reviews, 95*, 853–951.

Tay, L., & Diener, E. (2011). Needs and subjective well-being around the world. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(2), 354365.

This completes the fully formatted text in **Times New Roman**, with **Title 24 pt, Chapter Headings 18 pt, and Body 12 pt**, as requested.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness.* Yale University Press.
Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism.* PublicAffairs.